

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-5 are currently pending. Claims 1, 4 and 5 are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at pages 5 and 6.

No new matter has been introduced. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2006/0015906 to Boyer et al. (hereinafter, merely “Boyer”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,505 to Walker et al. (hereinafter, merely “Walker”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,013,478 to Hendricks et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hendricks”).

### **III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS**

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“An information processing apparatus comprising:

**...second registration means for registering second subsidiary information required for acquiring said second information...**

**...wherein subsidiary information content comprised of both first subsidiary information content and second subsidiary information content is stored in memory to be held after power down...**

**...wherein said first registration means or said second registration means using, if one of said first subsidiary information and said second subsidiary information is already registered, said one subsidiary information already registered for registration of the other subsidiary information,**

**wherein functions of the information processing apparatus comprises a function of receiving a television broadcast from a broadcasting station and a function of connecting to Internet through an Internet service provider,**

**wherein correspondence relationships between cities and broadcast territories are stored in a link table.**" (emphasis added)

First, the Office Action (see Office Action, page 4) relies on 136 in Figure 4, paragraphs [0081]-[0082], [0090], and [0094] of Boyer to reject "second registration means for registering second subsidiary information required for acquiring said second information", as recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that the Office Action (see the same page) also relies on the same portion of Boyer to reject Applicants' claimed feature of "first registration means for registering first subsidiary information required for acquiring said second information". However, Applicants submit that Boyer discloses and suggests only one registration process for acquiring Internet television program guide service. Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Boyer that teaches or suggests a second registration process for acquiring second information such as Internet. Therefore, Applicants submit that Boyer fails to teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

Second, the Office Action (see Office Action, page 6) relies on column 33, line 53-column 34, line 6 of Hendricks to reject “wherein subsidiary information content comprised of both first subsidiary information content and second subsidiary information content is stored in memory to be held after power down”, as recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that the cited portion of Hendricks discloses that personal profiles such as name, sex, age, place of birth, place of lower school education, employment type, level of education, amount of television program viewing per week, and the number of shows in particular categories, can be indefinitely stored in a nonvolatile memory. However, Applicants submit that Hendricks’ personal profile is not required for acquiring information in contrast with Applicants’ subsidiary information that is required for acquiring information. Therefore, Applicants submit that Hendricks fails to disclose or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

Furthermore, the Office Action (see Office Action, page 5) relies on Figure 10 and paragraph [0067] to reject “first registration means or said second registration means using, if one of said first subsidiary information and said second subsidiary information is already registered, said one subsidiary information already registered for registration of the other subsidiary information”, as recited in claim 1. Boyer indeed discloses that particular geographical location information inputted by a user when selecting television program guide service is also used for internet service such as listing local community events. However, Applicants submit that Boyer’s inputted geographical location for television program guide service is not used for registration of the Internet service in contrast with Applicants’ claimed

information is “for registration of the other subsidiary information”. Applicants submit that Boyer fails to disclose or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable.

In addition, Applicants submit that Boyer, Hendricks, and Walker, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “wherein functions of the information processing apparatus comprises a function of receiving a television broadcast from a broadcasting station and a function of connecting to Internet through an Internet service provider” and “wherein correspondence relationships between cities and broadcast territories are stored in a link table”, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable.

For similar or somewhat similar reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, claims 4 and 5 are also patentable.

#### **IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the above-identified reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.


#### **CONCLUSION**

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800